

Remarks

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 2, 23, and 27-29 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,561,103 (“Horiguchi”) in view of Szeliski et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,993,156 (“Szeliski”). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Horiguchi in view of Szeliski.

Horiguchi discloses a technique for inspecting picture patterns on prints which are being run in a rotary press, and more particularly to a method in which reference data read out of a reference print is written in a memory, and inspection data read out of a print under inspection is compared with the reference data for every picture element for instance to determine whether or not the print is acceptable, and an apparatus for practicing the method. The specific feature of the invention resides in that (1) in reading the above-described data a print running speed or the position of a picture pattern in the direction of width is detected to rewrite the reference data, (2) in data comparison, the comparison level is optionally set up, and (3) the data comparison is carried out not only for every picture element, but also for the sum of picture elements over the entire picture pattern and for the sum of picture elements arranged linearly in the print running direction. See Horiguchi at Abstract.

Szeliski discloses using an affine transform. See Szeliski at col. 13, ll. 10-36.

Claim 1 of the present application recites an alignment process that creates an initial replacement image from a scanned image by performing an interpolation to generate additional lines in the scanned images to correspond to the digitized source images.

Applicant submits that neither Horiguchi nor Szeliski disclose or suggest creating an initial replacement image from a scanned image by performing an interpolation to generate additional lines in the scanned images to correspond to the digitized source images. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Horiguchi in view of Szeliski.

Claims 2-10 and 11-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,013,803 (“Hansen”). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Hansen.

Hansen discloses a color registration control system for a printing press including an area scanner for acquiring an image of a paper substrate and an image processing system adapted to receive the image and process the image to determine any color register error. See Hansen at Abstract.

Claim 2 of the present application recites an alignment process that creates a replacement image from a scanned image by performing an interpolation to generate additional lines in the scanned images to correspond to the digitized source images. Applicant submits that Hansen does not disclose a process of *creating an initial replacement image from a scanned image by performing an interpolation to generate additional lines in the scanned images to correspond to the digitized source images*. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Hansen.

Claim 23 recites embedding two or more synchronization-strips into a digitized source image to form a marked source image to locate lines in a first stream of the digitized source image with a second stream of the digitized source image, wherein the synchronization-strips have a counter pattern at defined intervals to provide a unique page count.

Applicant submits that nowhere in Hansen is there disclosed a process of *embedding synchronization-strips that have a counter pattern at defined intervals to provide a unique page count*. Thus, claim 23 and its dependent claims are patentable over Hansen.

Independent claim 27 includes limitations similar to those recited in claim 23. Therefore claim 27 is patentable over Hansen for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 23.

Claim 28 recites a printer that prints a marked source image with embedded synchronization-strips in a sacrificial portion of a page to form a printed copy. Applicant submits that Hansen does not disclose such a feature. Therefore, claim 28 and its dependent claim are patentable over Hansen.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to Deposit Account No. 50-3669.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: 10/29/08

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(303) 740-1980